

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_119724
Title of the Manuscript:	Digital Literacy Among Agricultural Extension Agents in North Maluku, Indonesia
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses a critical aspect of agricultural development in North Maluku, Indonesia. By assessing the digital literacy levels of agricultural extension agents, the study provides valuable insights into the challenges and opportunities for enhancing digital skills within this sector. This research is timely and relevant, considering the increasing role of digital technologies in agricultural practices and extension services.</p> <p>2. The title "Digital Literacy Among Agricultural Extension Agents in North Maluku, Indonesia" is suitable and accurately reflects the content and scope of the study.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive, providing a clear summary of the study's objectives, methodology, key findings, and implications. It succinctly highlights the importance of digital literacy among agricultural extension agents and the need for targeted interventions.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The paper is well-organized, with clearly defined sections including the introduction, methodology, results, and discussion. Each section logically flows into the next, making the manuscript easy to follow.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. The methodology is robust, employing a validated questionnaire and appropriate statistical analyses. The findings are well-supported by the data presented, and the discussion contextualizes the results within the broader literature.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and mostly recent, providing a solid foundation for the study. However, there is room to include more recent studies on digital literacy in agricultural extension, especially those published within the last two years, to enhance the relevance and currency of the literature review.</p> <p>Additional Suggestions/Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be beneficial to elaborate more on the specific digital literacy training programs that could be implemented based on the study's findings. • Consider discussing potential barriers to digital literacy improvement among agricultural extension agents and suggest ways to overcome these challenges. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are some grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that need to be corrected to improve readability. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the abstract: "ICT usage proficiency was capable (61% ± 14.5)" should be rephrased for clarity. • In the introduction: "However The sector faces complex issues like climate change" should be corrected to "However, the sector faces complex issues such as climate change." 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript makes a significant contribution to the field of agricultural extension and digital literacy. The findings have practical implications for policy makers and educators involved in the training and development of extension agents.</p> <p>The manuscript requires minor revisions primarily to improve the language quality and to update the references with more recent studies. The content is scientifically sound and contributes valuable insights into the digital literacy of agricultural extension agents in North Maluku, Indonesia.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Navendu Nidhan
Department, University & Country	Gopal Narayan Singh University, India